DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 639 HE 002 011

AUTHOR	Ferrin, Richard I.; Willingham, Warren W.
TITLE	Practices of Southern Institutions in Recognizing College-Level Achievement. Higher Education Surveys, Report Number 3.
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	R-3
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Regional Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 17 Executive Park Drive, N.E., Suite 200, Atlanta, Georgia 30329
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Acceleration, *Advanced Placement, *Advanced Placement Programs, College Credits, *College Freshmen, *Equivalency Tests, *Higher Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent colleges recognize college-level achievement acquired in nontraditional ways, their purposes for such recognition, the mechanisms they use, and the manner in which they handle course exemption and credit. The results were based on responses to a survey from a representative group of 141 institutions in the South. Some of the principal findings were: (1) two-thirds of all institutions, including practically all public 4-year colleges, grant advanced standing through course exemptions. Approximately one freshman in nine received such exemption in fall 1970; (2) public colleges tend to consider acceleration a more important rationale for granting exemption than enrichment, whereas private colleges hold the opposite view. In both types of institutions about one-half of the freshmen receiving course exemption also received credit toward graduation; (3) departmental examinations, Advanced Placement examinations, and USAFI courses are the mechanisms accepted for advanced standing by the largest number of institutions; and (4) although acceptance of each mechanism has increased at the institutional level since 1968, the proportion of freshmen involved has remained relatively constant. (Author/AF)

EDO 47639

JAN 26 1971

N-CEEB
HE

Practices of Southern Institutions in Recognizing College-Level Achievement

Richard I. Ferrin and Warren W. Willingham

Higher Education Surveys
Report No. 3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEEB

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE 002 011

College Entrance Examination Board, December 1970

The College Entrance Examination Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for schools and colleges. The membership is composed of colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on committees that consider the Board's programs and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Copies of this report may be obtained from the Southern Regional Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 17 Executive Park Drive, N.E., Suite 200, Atlanta, Georgia 30329.

Copyright © 1970 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

ED047639

Practices of Southern Institutions in Recognizing College-Level Achievement

Richard I. Ferrin and Warren W. Willingham

Higher Education Surveys
Report No. 3

College Entrance Examination Board, December 1970

HIGHER EDUCATION SURVEYS REPORTS

Copies of previous reports may be obtained from the Publications Order Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Box 592, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Report No. 1 — Admission of Minority Students in Midwestern Colleges. May, 1970

Report No. 2 — Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers. November, 1970

SOUTHERN COMMITTEE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION SURVEYS NO. 3

Harold M. Stahmer, Chairman
Associate Dean, College of the Arts and Sciences
University of Florida

S. A. Burnette, President
Central Virginia Community College

Albert L. Clary, Registrar
Louisiana State University

Martha Ellison, Coordinator, Curriculum Development
Kentucky State Department of Education

Robert N. Fortenberry, Assistant Superintendent
Huntsville City Schools

Kenneth N. Vickery, Dean of Administrative Affairs
Clemson University

Charles N. Watson, Director of Admissions
Emory University

Higher Education Surveys is an activity of the College Entrance Examination Board. Its purpose is to provide member institutions with a convenient means of gathering pertinent information about important current problems in college admissions. The survey described in this report was executed by the Southern Committee for Higher Education Surveys No. 3 with the staff support of Richard Ferrin and Warren Willingham of the College Board's Access Research Office in Palo Alto, California, and Stephen Ivens and Robert Stoltz of the College Board's Southern Regional Office in Atlanta, Georgia. The Southern Committee is responsible for defining the topic and for the specific questions included in this survey. The College Board staff is responsible for gathering the data and reporting the results. Since a primary objective of this project is to make known the results obtained from the committee's questionnaire as rapidly as practical, this staff report is a factual accounting without interpretation or evaluation. The staff and committee are grateful to the many respondents who made this rapid survey possible by returning questionnaires within a few days.

Contents

Abstract. 1
Introduction. 3
Procedure 6
Results 9

Tables:
1. The total population of Southern colleges and the constitution of the original sample and actual respondents 19

2. Percentage of institutions granting course exemption, and the extent to which Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen received such exemption--by institutional type and racial composition. . . .20

3. Percentage of Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption who received exemption/credit, and average number of quarter hours they received--by institutional type. 21

4. Percentage of those institutions granting course exemption that rate various rationales for such practices "very important"--by institutional type 22

5. Percentage of those institutions granting course exemption that rate various influences in the establishment or expansion of exemption/credit policies "very important"--by institutional type. 23

6. Percentage of institutions using various mechanisms to grant course exemption (with or without credit)--by institutional type and racial composition. 24

7. Percentage of institutions using various mechanisms to grant course exemption plus credit toward graduation--by institutional type and racial composition 25

8. Percentage of institutions that have granted course exemption for various periods of time--by mechanism and institutional type. .26

9. Percentage of institutions that expect to begin using various mechanisms within two years--by institutional type. 27

10. Percentage of Fall, 1968 and Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption that received such exemption (with or without credit)--by mechanism and institutional type. 28

11. Percentage of Fall, 1968 and Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption that received both exemption plus credit toward graduation--by mechanism and institutional type. 29

12. Extent of college-credit summer (1970) and dual enrollment (Fall, 1970) programs for current high school students--by institutional type. 30

13. Percentage of institutions that inform freshmen of exemption/credit decisions upon acceptance for admission--by mechanism and institutional type. 31

14. Percentage of institutions that require "double validation" before granting exemption/credit--by mechanism and institutional type. 32

15. Nature of institutional practices of recording credit--by mechanism and institutional type. 33

16. Nature of institutional practices in accepting credit hours granted to transfer students by former institutions--by mechanism and institutional type. 35

Bibliography. 37

Survey respondents. 39

Questionnaire 41

Abstract

This survey was concerned with the extent to which colleges recognize college-level achievement acquired in nontraditional ways, their purposes for such recognition, the mechanisms they use, and the manner in which they handle course exemption and credit. Results were based on responses from a representative group of 141 institutions in the South. Principal findings were:

1. Two-thirds of all institutions, including practically all public 4-year colleges, grant advanced standing through course exemptions. Approximately one freshman in nine received such exemption in Fall, 1970.
2. Typically, public colleges consider acceleration a more important rationale for granting exemption than enrichment, whereas private colleges hold the opposite view. Nevertheless, in both types of institutions about one-half of those freshmen receiving course exemption also received credit toward graduation.
3. Departmental examinations, Advanced Placement examinations, and USAFI courses are the mechanisms accepted for advanced standing by the largest number of institutions.
4. Although acceptance of each mechanism has increased at the institutional level since 1968, the proportion of freshmen involved has remained relatively constant.
5. Institutions do not typically inform students upon acceptance for admission of the amount of advanced standing or credit they will receive. In fact, a good many defer such decisions until successful completion of subsequent coursework.
6. About one-half the public 4-year colleges and one-fourth the public 2-year and private colleges have developed college-credit summer and dual enrollment programs for high school students.

Introduction

Ever since Thomas Jefferson established the University of Virginia in 1825 and began tinkering with traditional education structure and curriculum (Rudolph, 1965), attempts to increase the flexibility of higher education in the United States have flourished Some have been successful, others abortive. One long-standing attempt, augmented recently by the emphasis on expansion of educational opportunity, has centered on the concept that what a person knows is more important than how he came to know it. To this end examinations have been developed, independent-study degree programs have been established, guides to the evaluation of college-level achievement from noncollegiate sources have been created, and external degree programs have been proposed. Institutions naturally vary in their acceptance of these and other forms of validation of academic accomplishment, each desiring sovereignty in its distribution of two critical commodities--course exemption and college credit.

The purpose of this survey is to provide current information on the extent to which institutions recognize the knowledge a student has acquired in nontraditional ways, their purposes for such recognition, the mechanisms they use, and the manner in which they handle exemption and credit. This survey was undertaken in the South because of current interest in the topic among educational leaders in that region. Whereas the results may well suggest national conditions, they obviously cannot be generalized automatically to other regions.

Information concerning exemption practices should be useful to the educational community for at least two reasons. First, little attention has been given to this type of assessment, either nationally or regionally. Most of the material that does exist

is either an essay, a polemic, or a description of specific programs (Flaugher, et al, 1967). Notable exceptions include Hedrick's (1960) study of credit-by-examination practices among Midwestern colleges and Dyer and Valley's (1962) analysis of off-campus educational patterns and their acceptance by collegiate institutions. Other studies have provided valuable information on the extent to which particular programs are being used[1] (Peterson, 1965-66; Casserly, 1968-69; American Council on Education, 1969; College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), but data on how and why different types of institutions use various programs or mechanisms remain scant.

Second, numerous proposals for reforming the structure and timing of higher education have come to the fore in recent months. Since several are directly related to the issue of college credit, the data presented in this report should help put these suggestions in perspective and contribute to their construction and evaluation. Examples of such proposals follow:

1. The New York Commissioner of Education, Ewald T. Nyquist, announced in September that within the next two years his state would establish a program to award external undergraduate degrees (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1970). Other states (for example, Florida) are considering similar moves.
2. Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, suggested in a speech at the College Board's annual

---

1. Indicative of the increased interest in credit by examination is the growth of two College Board programs. Advanced Placement began in 1955 with 1,200 examinees, but by 1969-70 the figure had increased to over 55,000. The College-Level Examination Program, established only five years ago, gave examinations to about 30,000 students in 1969-70, a jump of approximately 300% since its inception.

meeting in October that institutions like Britain's new Open University be established in this country. Open University is exclusively an external degree institution that uses mailed syllabi, radio courses, local tutorials, and institutional examinations (Pifer, 1970).

3. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommended in November that the amount of time required for the bachelor's degree be reduced, opportunities and incentives for lifelong learning be increased, and "alternative avenues by which students can earn degrees or complete a major portion of their work for a degree" be expanded (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970).
4. Many leaders within the educational and political communities have espoused the idea that at least some students should engage in apprentice or service activities between high school and college, several of them suggesting that some college credit might be earned through such activities (Brewster, 1970; Gardner, 1970; Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970).

This survey was developed to provide answers to questions such as: How widespread is the practice of granting advanced standing? What proportion of all first-time freshmen are involved? What programs or mechanisms are most widely used? Do institutions tend to grant credit toward graduation or simply course exemption? What developments in credit practices do colleges anticipate over the next few years? Do transfer students tend to lose advanced credit awarded by another institution? To what extent are institutions participating in college-level programs for high school students? Answers to such questions are particularly important at this time as financial pressures, student mobility, demands for accountability, and concern for relevant curriculums all increase.

Procedure

One important objective of Higher Education Surveys is to make results available quickly, thereby eliminating much of the usual time lag between collecting data and reporting findings. Consequently, the survey procedures and the questionnaire itself were designed to facilitate both rapid responses from the colleges and rapid analysis. A single-page questionnaire was used, and it was intended that answers to practically all questions would be quantifiable (see questionnaire on page 41).

Another objective of Higher Education Surveys is to bring together a group of educational leaders to assist in the conduct of the study and to develop the questionnaire. The Southern committee (see list of members at the front of this report) met on October 15 to discuss problems related to recognition of college-level achievement and to identify particular issues deserving study and applicable to rapid survey techniques. The issues identified centered on the reasons for awarding course exemption, the extent to which exemption practices now exist, the validation mechanisms used, the amount of credit[2] awarded, and the conditions under which exemption/credit is granted. On November 12 the committee gathered to select and edit the specific items included in the questionnaire.

Several of the questions necessitated responses in terms of each of seven mechanisms. Brief descriptions of each follow:

AP - Advanced Placement Program (CEEB)

Provides course descriptions and consultant assistance to help high schools establish college-level courses.

---

2. When the term "credit" is used in this report it will generally refer only to that which is earned in some manner other than regular classwork.

Largely on the basis of the content of these courses, it develops and administers examinations in 11 subject-matter areas and encourages colleges to grant credit for satisfactory performance on these examinations.

CLEP - College-Level Examination Program (CEEB)
A national program of examinations to evaluate the academic achievement of people who have reached a college level of education outside the classroom. Includes General Examinations in five basic liberal arts areas and Subject Examinations in 28 widely taught undergraduate courses.

ACT - Student Assessment Program (ACT)
Designed to measure academic potential in four areas and also to obtain a profile of interests and activities through objective tests and a student information blank.

Ach - Achievement Tests (CEEB)
Objective tests that measure level of accomplishment at the secondary school level in 15 subject fields.

Exam - Departmental Examinations
Subject-matter examinations developed and administered by departments at individual institutions.

USAFI - United States Armed Forces Institute
Provides correspondence and group study courses in a wide range of subject areas to active duty personnel in all branches of the military service.

ACE - Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in The Armed Forces (compiled and published by ACE)
A volume that analyzes, summarizes, and lists credit recommendations for service school courses at the post-secondary level. Most recent edition published in 1968.

This survey was based on a representative sample of Southern

institutions. As Table I indicates, the sample was drawn in such a way that balance with respect to control, selectivity, and size could be achieved. Religious and special purpose institutions were sampled separately. The former are not necessarily those with a formal religious affiliation, but are rather those which place heavy emphasis on religious practice or which train for religious work; the latter specialize in fields such as music or art.

Approximately one-third of all Southern institutions were surveyed, and sampling proportions were set so that sufficient returns would be available for analysis of three basic groups of colleges: private, public 4-year, and public 2-year. This breakdown required oversampling among public 4-year institutions (including universities), but final results were adjusted so that all institutions were weighted properly.

Since predominantly black colleges have played such a prominent role in Southern higher education and since such institutions constitute about one-fifth of all institutions in this region, the committee felt it important to analyze certain responses in terms of the racial composition of the student body. To accomplish this, institutions were simply separated into two groups: predominantly black and others. The former were operationally defined as those colleges in which black students account for at least 90 percent of the total enrollment this year. It should be remembered, however, that practically all predominantly black colleges in the South are 95 percent black or more. In this sample only one institution traditionally regarded as predominantly black enrolled between 50 and 90 percent blacks.

Questionnaires were mailed on November 16 to either directors of admissions or registrars (unless the presidents had earlier designated someone else as the appropriate respondent). By

December 2 usable replies had been obtained from 86 percent of the 164 institutions in the sample (see list of Survey Respondents on page 39 and also the analysis of sample returns in Table 1).

Results

Extent of course exemption

Two-thirds of the Southern institutions in this sample award advanced standing through course exemption. Those awarding advanced standing include almost all the public 4-year colleges, two-thirds of the private colleges, and one-half of the public 2-year colleges. They also include 71 percent of the predominantly white institutions and 36 percent of the predominantly black (Table 2).

A much lower proportion of freshmen in public 2-year colleges receive course exemption than in private or public 4-year institutions. This is particularly interesting when one considers that public 2-year colleges typically have students with a wide range of academic talent and a diversity of education backgrounds.

According to Table 3 about one-half of the freshmen receiving advanced standing through course exemption receive credit toward graduation as well. Those receiving credit typically are granted more advanced standing (in terms of quarter hours received) than those granted exemption without credit.

Purposes for course exemption

Colleges and universities, like people, often perform the same activity, but they may have quite different reasons for doing so. Both public and private institutions consider the recognition of applicants' talents and abilities to be the most important rationale for course exemption, but they disagree on the effect such recognition should have on students' programs (Table 4).

Public colleges consider acceleration to be more important than enrichment, whereas private colleges regard enrichment as more important. Not many institutions, public or private, indicated that either aiding in recruitment or reducing overall institutional costs was a particularly important reasons for granting credit.

Whereas policy rationales may tend to be somewhat theoretical and idealistic, influences behind policy are likely to be more practical. In this survey respondents were asked to indicate those influences which they considered "very important" in the development of their course exemption policies over the past five years. Public 2-year and private colleges both placed student concerns at the top of the list, whereas public 4-year colleges felt that developments within high schools were most important (Table 5). As with rationales, financial considerations have evidently had little influence at any type of college.

Types of mechanisms

Seven mechanisms through which students may earn advanced standing in college were briefly described on pages 6 and 7. These mechanisms have been used in varying degrees and by different types of institutions throughout the South.

Departmental examinations are the most widely used of the seven mechanisms; 50 percent of the institutions indicate current usage (Table 6). Second is Advanced Placement (39 percent), followed by USAFI courses (35 percent). Departmental exams and USAFI courses are the only mechanisms used by a large number of black institutions. Most institutions that grant course exemption are also willing to grant graduation credit with each mechanism they use (Table 7).

No public 2-year college in the sample indicated usage of any mechanism prior to 1960 (Table 8), although one must remember

that more than three-fourths of such institutions have come into existence since that date. A few public 4-year and private institutions granted exemption before 1960, but the use of national examinations is largely a phenomenon of this decade.

Looking into the near future, very few institutions indicated they expect to begin using new mechanisms--with the exception of CLEP. Nearly one-fourth of those institutions not now using CLEP anticipate such usage within two years (Tables 8 and 9). This expectation holds for each of the three institutional types, although the percentage was highest in the case of public 4-year colleges.

In any discussion of the recognition of college-level achievement, one of the most critical questions centers on the extent to which students have actually been granted advanced standing. Table 10 documents the fact that even in institutions using a particular mechanism, less than 15 percent of the freshmen received exemption in Fall, 1970. In most cases the figure is close to 5 percent. Also, although there has been an increase in the acceptance of each mechanism among institutions within the past two years, the proportion of freshmen affected by each mechanism has remained relatively constant.

By comparing Tables 10 and 11 it is evident that for four of the seven mechanisms most freshmen receiving exemption also receive credit. In two others, departmental exams and Advanced Placement, slightly more than one-half receive both. The College Board Achievement Tests, on the other hand, appear to be used almost exclusively for advanced standing without credit.

Now for a closer look at what the findings reveal about each mechanism:

AP - Ten years ago 4 percent of all institutions in the region used the Advanced Placement Program; currently 39 percent

do, making it the most widely used national examination for exemption/credit. It is used by two-thirds of the public 4-year institutions, nearly one-half of the private colleges, but only 8 percent of the public 2-year colleges. Of this last group, however, 11 percent indicated they expect to begin using AP within two years. Most of the institutions using AP award both exemption and credit, and two-thirds of the freshmen receiving advanced standing in both 1968 and 1970 were granted course credit as well as exemption. In private institutions using AP, a much larger proportion of freshmen are involved than is true in public colleges.

CLEP - Although less than one-fourth of all Southern institutions presently use CLEP, two indicators suggest that it is the fastest growing of the seven mechanisms. First, more institutions started using it in the past two years than any other mechanism. Second, 17 percent of all institutions indicated they expect to begin using CLEP within the next two years, a figure more than twice that given for any other mechanism. If these expectations are realized, over one-half of all public 4-year colleges and nearly 40 percent of public 2-year and private institutions will be using CLEP by Fall, 1972. Despite its growth at the institutional level, less than 1 percent of the freshmen on these campuses received any advanced standing through CLEP in either 1968 or 1970.

ACT - ACT's Student Assessment Program is used as an admissions tool by many institutions in the South. The Data from this survey indicate that it is also used to determine course exemption by 11 percent of Southern

institutions. Typically, students earn credit as well. In public 2-year colleges using ACT for placement an average of 15 percent of all freshmen receive advanced standing in some field.

Ach - The College Board Achievement Tests, like ACT, are used for placement by a small number of institutions (18 percent). Most of the colleges within this group began using the tests between 1960 and 1968. They are used almost exclusively to grant exemption without credit. Some of the data suggest that their use as a placement mechanism may be diminishing. It is the only mechanism for which a lower proportion of freshmen received exemption in 1970 than in 1968. Also, no public colleges indicated an expectation to begin using Achievement Tests for placement in the next two years.

Exam - Departmental examinations are used for placement in one-half of all institutions, including 70 percent of all public 4-year colleges. This is also one of two mechanisms used extensively by black institutions. Most of the public institutions using departmental exams grant both exemption and credit; among private colleges using this mechanism, two out of five grant exemption only. Departmental examinations have been in use as an exemption mechanism longer than any of the other six, particularly in public 4-year colleges. In these institutions over one-half of those currently using them began usage prior to 1960. This mechanism is not only used by more institutions than the others, but it also affects more freshmen than all other mechanisms combined. Few institutions indicated they expect to begin using this mechanism within the next two years.

USAFI - Courses taken through USAFI are accepted by one-third of all institutions. In practically every case credit as well as exemption is awarded. This is the only external mechanism used extensively by black institutions, and it is also the only one used equally by black and white institutions. Although institutions have increasingly accepted use of the mechanism since USAFI's inception in 1941, very few freshmen actually receive exemption through USAFI courses. Another interesting fact is that although more public 4-year colleges employ the mechanism than the other institutional types, not one such institution began usage within the past two years nor do any anticipate beginning usage within the next two years.

ACE - Approximately one institution in five grants exemption based upon recommendations in the Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services. Like USAFI, credit as well as exemption is almost always awarded. Traditionally, public 4-year colleges have been the institutions most receptive to the Guide, but in the past two years 10 percent of all private colleges have adopted it as a placement mechanism. Although more institutions of all types use USAFI courses than use the Guide, a much larger proportion of the freshmen at institutions recognizing the Guide receive advanced standing than do those at institutions recognizing USAFI. According to Table 9 very few colleges expect to begin using the Guide within the next two years.

Several institutions also indicated they used other mechanisms. Most are examinations developed by and for a specific college, but a few are national programs, such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test,

the Differential Aptitude Test, and the Modern Language Aptitude Test.

In addition to the aforementioned mechanisms focused specifically on college enrollees, a large number of institutions have developed programs whereby they bring high school students on campus to participate in college-level courses. Two such activities are summer programs and dual enrollment programs. One or both are operated by nearly one-half of all public 4-year colleges and about one-fourth of all public 2-year and private colleges (Table 12). In summer programs students either join in regular classes or meet in special institutes. In the summer of 1970 an average of 24 students were involved on each Southern campus with such a program.

Dual enrollment programs include two types of high school students: those taking some courses at the college and some at their own high school, and those taking all their academic work at the college. In the latter case the student's high school will typically grant him full credit toward graduation for whatever time he spends at the college. Participating colleges enrolled an average of 16 students in some form of dual enrollment this fall.

Conditions on usage

Institutions do not typically inform students upon acceptance for admission of the amount of advanced standing or credit they will receive. Those applicants requesting validation of their military educational experiences through either USAFI or the ACE Guide have the best chance of getting an early decision (Table 13).

Approximately one-fourth of those institutions that grant credit based on CLEP, ACT, or departmental exams indicated that such credit is contingent upon successful completion of subsequent

coursework taken at that institution (Table 14). This is especially true for CLEP in private institutions and ACT and departmental exams in public ones.

Most institutions do not record any grade for credit earned through any of the seven mechanisms (Table 15). In those that do, the grade is generally dependent upon the individual case and is generally computed into the student's grade-point average. A few public 4-year colleges automatically award "A" when they accept an AP score and "C" when they accept military courses through either USAFI or the Guide. The mechanisms through which students are most likely to receive grades are USAFI courses, departmental exams, and College Board Achievement Tests. Students are least likely to receive grades through CLEP.

When students transfer from one institution to another, there is often the question of what will happen to the credits already earned. One interest of this survey was to find out how receiving institutions treated those credits a student had been awarded through one of the seven mechanisms. Although there was some variation from mechanism to mechanism, approximately one-half of the institutions indicated they would accept the credits automatically toward graduation (Table 16). About one in four indicated they would accept the credits with various qualifications. Only one in five stated they would not accept the credits toward graduation. Considering all mechanisms, private colleges are more likely to accept credits automatically than are public institutions. The mechanism most likely to be accepted automatically is AP.

Anticipated developments

The majority of respondents indicated that not only will their institution's policies for granting exemption/credit expand over

the next few years, but also that the degree of usage students make of various mechanisms will increase. Several respondents noted that they expect to give credit in some areas in which they are now granting only course exemption. Although he did not identify the model, one individual commented that "We shall be changing to a new academic model next year which will permit far greater opportunities for students to receive exemption/credit." Another saw expanded exemption/credit policies as a vehicle to move his institution toward greater individualization of student programs.

Although no one indicated they thought their policies would be cut back, one respondent stated: "Rather great changes have occurred within the last two years. No further changes are considered now. We will need time to fully understand the implications of the changes already made." A great many echoed the sentiment of another with respect to the next few years: "The major change will be increased use of the mechanism by students and faculty."

Table 1. The total population of Southern colleges and the constitution of the original sample and actual respondents

Type	All colleges	Sample ratio	Original sample	Actual respondents	% of original sample	% of actual respondents
Public						
4-year						
Selective-over 15,000	7	.5	4	4	2%	3%
Selective-5,000-15,000	19	.5	10	8	6	6
Selective-under 5,000	38	.5	19	16	12	11
Non-selective-over 5,000	18	.5	9	9	5	6
Non-selective-under 5,000	25	.5	12	9	7	6
2-year						
Over 1,000	73	.25	18	17	11	12
Under 1,000	94	.25	23	20	14	14
Private						
Liberal arts						
Selective-over 1,000	48	.25	12	11	7	8
Selective-under 1,000	62	.25	16	15	10	11
Non-selective-over 600	31	.25	8	6	5	4
Non-selective-under 600	35	.25	9	6	5	4
Religious						
Over 600	41	.25	10	10	6	7
Under 600	43	.25	11	9	7	6
Special purpose	12	.25	3	1	2	1
Total	546		164	141	99	99

Table 2. Percentage of institutions granting course exemption, and the extent to which Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen received such exemption--by institutional type and racial composition

Type of institution	% of institutions granting course exemption	% of freshmen receiving course exemption
Type of institution		
Private	67%	13%
Public 4-year	85	15
Public 2-year	51	4
Racial composition		
Predominantly Negro*	36	2
All others	71	11
All institutions	66	11

*Those institutions where black students account for at least 90% of the total enrollment in 1970-71. Thirty such colleges were included in the sample.

Table 3. Percentage of Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption who received exemption/credit, and average number of quarter hours they received--by institutional type

Type of institution	% of freshmen receiving		Ave. quarter hours received	
	Exemption (with or without credit)	Exemption with credit	Exemption without credit	Exemption with credit
Private	17%	8%	6.7	9.3
Public 4-year	15	7	5.0	8.7
Public 2-year	7	4	8.1	6.6
All institutions	14	7	6.5	8.5

Table 4. Percentage of those institutions granting course exemption that rate various rationales for such practices "very important"--by institutional type

Rationales	Type of institution: Private	Public 4-year	Public 2-year	All institutions
Enrich student program	44%	41%	26%	39%
Accelerate student program	36	51	53	44
Create curricular flexibility	26	31	32	28
Expand educational opportunity	38	44	42	41
Aid in recruitment	26	28	26	26
Improve educational continuity from high school to college	23	31	37	28
Recognize applicants' talents and abilities	44	74	63	56
Reduce overall cost of higher education	15	10	16	14

Table 5. Percentage of those institutions granting course exemption that rate various influences in the establishment or expansion of exemption/credit policies "very important"--by institutional type

Influences	Type of institution			
	Private	Public 4-year	Public 2-year	All institutions
Adult community interest	10%	5%	21%	12%
Faculty attitudes	31	41	16	30
Student concerns	49	36	68	50
Financial considerations	15	5	5	10
Developments within high schools	15	51	11	23
Competition from other institutions	26	15	16	21

Table 6. Percentage of institutions using various mechanisms to grant course exemption (with or without credit)--by institutional type and racial composition

	Mechanisms*						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Type of institution							
Private	47%	22%	12%	23%	45%	40%	24%
Public 4-year	67	30	20	22	70	46	43
Public 2-year	8	19	8	14	46	24	14
Racial composition							
Predominantly black	11	6	0	8	33	33	11
All others	44	25	14	20	52	35	24
All institutions	39	23	11	18	50	35	25

*See pages 6 and 7 for explanation of each mechanism.

290

Table 7. Percentage of institutions using various mechanisms to grant course exemption plus credit toward graduation--by institutional type and racial composition

	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Type of institution							
Private	40%	21%	3%	10%	28%	38%	21%
Public 4-year	63	28	11	13	52	46	41
Public 2-year	5	19	5	5	46	19	11
Racial composition							
Predominantly black	3	3	0	3	19	33	11
All others	39	25	7	11	42	34	24
All institutions	33	22	6	9	38	33	22

Table 8. Percentage of institutions that have granted course exemption for various periods of time--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private							
Not using	53%	78%	88%	78%	55%	62%	76%
1-2 years	9	10	3	2	5	9	10
3-10 years	34	12	9	19	33	22	9
Over 10 years	3	0	0	2	7	7	5
Public 4-year							
Not using	33	70	80	78	30	54	57
1-2 years	11	17	2	4	9	0	4
3-10 years	46	13	17	17	24	24	15
Over 10 years	11	0	0	0	37	22	24
Public 2-year							
Not using	92	81	92	86	54	76	86
1-2 years	0	16	3	5	19	5	3
3-10 years	8	3	5	8	27	19	11
Over 10 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All institutions							
Not using	61	77	88	81	50	65	75
1-2 years	6	14	3	3	10	6	7
3-10 years	28	9	9	15	29	22	11
Over 10 years	4	0	0	1	11	8	7

Table 9. Percentage of institutions that expect to begin using various mechanisms within two years--by institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private	7%	14%	7%	9%	3%	5%	2%
Public 4-year	4	22	2	0	4	0	2
Public 2-year	11	19	5	0	5	5	5
All institutions	8	17	6	4	4	4	3

Table 10. Percentage of Fall, 1968 and Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption that received such exemption (with or without credit)--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms													
	AP		CLEP		ACT		Ach		Exam		USAFI		ACE	
	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70
Private	10%	9%	1%	3%	5%	5%	12%	10%	9%	9%	1%	4%	4%	7%
Public 4-year	2	2	1	1	8	5	10	8	8	10	1	1	2	3
Public 2-year	0	0	1	1	14	15	17	15	5	4	3	2	9	15
All institutions	3	3	1	1	9	9	11	8	8	9	1	1	3	4

Table 11. Percentage of Fall, 1968 and Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen in institutions granting course exemption that received both exemption plus credit toward graduation--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms													
	AP		CLEP		ACT		Ach		Exam		USAFI		ACE	
	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70	'68	'70
Private	7%	6%	1%	2%	0%	1%	3%	3%	8%	9%	1%	4%	4%	10%
Public 4-year	1	2	1	1	9	10	3	1	3	5	1	1	2	3
Public 2-year	0	0	1	1	9	10	1	0	4	4	3	2	9	15
All institutions	2	2	1	1	8	9	3	1	3	5	1	1	3	4

Table 12. Extent of college-credit summer (1970) and dual enrollment (Fall, 1970) programs for current high school students--by institutional type

Type of institution	Summer programs		Dual enrollment	
	% institutions participating	Average enrollment	% institutions participating	Average enrollment
Private	26%	9	26%	17
Public 4-year	48	29	46	9
Public 2-year	27	40	24	23
All institutions	31	24	29	16

Table 13. Percentage of institutions that inform freshmen of exemption/credit decisions upon acceptance for admission--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private	30%	15%	17%	18%	4%	35%	29%
Public 4-year	29	36	0	20	0	43	53
Public 2-year	33	29	67	0	18	38	67
All institutions	30	24	22	14	7	37	42

Table 14. Percentage of institutions that require "double validation"* before granting exemption/credit--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private	7%	38%	17%	9%	15%	22%	14%
Public 4-year	6	0	33	10	31	5	5
Public 2-year	0	14	33	0	35	0	0
All institutions	7	22	26	7	25	16	9

*"Double validation" means requiring successful completion of additional course work taken at that institution

Table 15. Nature of institutional practices of recording credit--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private							
Compute into GPA,							
with grade of "A"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with grade of "B"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "C"	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade dependent on individual case	13	18	50	20	18	32	25
Give grade, but do not compute into GPA	8	9	0	20	24	14	8
Give no grade	75	73	50	60	59	55	67
Public 4-year							
Compute into GPA,							
with grade of "A"	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "B"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "C"	0	0	0	0	0	5	12
with grade dependent on individual case	17	0	20	14	40	16	0
Give grade, but do not compute into GPA	3	8	20	14	0	11	12
Give no grade	76	92	60	71	60	68	76

Table 15. Continued

Type of institutions	Mechanisms AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Public 2-year							
Compute into GPA, with grade of "A"	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
with grade of "B"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "C"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade dependent on individual case	100	14	0	50	25	29	29
Give grade, but do not compute into GPA	0	14	0	0	13	14	14
Give no grade	0	71	100	50	63	57	57
All institutions							
Compute into GPA, with grade of "A"	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "B"	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
with grade of "C"	2	0	0	0	0	1	4
with grade dependent on individual case	19	12	23	24	26	29	17
Give grade, but do not compute into GPA	6	10	8	14	13	13	10
Give no grade	72	78	69	62	60	58	69

Table 16. Nature of institutional practices in accepting credit hours granted to transfer students by former institutions--by mechanism and institutional type

Type of institution	Mechanisms						
	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE
Private							
Accept automatically toward graduation	58%	59%	67%	69%	55%	59%	67%
Accept with qualifications	33	35	25	23	36	30	17
Do not accept toward grad.	10	6	8	8	9	9	17
Public 4-year							
Accept automatically toward graduation	63	38	50	33	56	38	44
Accept with qualifications	30	38	21	47	31	38	36
Do not accept toward grad.	7	24	29	20	13	25	20
Public 2-year							
Accept automatically toward graduation	62	57	33	58	36	41	46
Accept with qualifications	0	14	25	8	41	24	15
Do not accept toward grad.	38	29	42	33	23	35	38
All institutions							
Accept automatically toward graduation	60	53	50	57	48	49	54
Accept with qualifications	25	29	24	23	37	29	22
Do not accept toward grad.	15	18	26	20	15	21	24

Bibliography

Brewster, Kingman, Jr. "Pressures Force Too Many to Go to College, Says Yale's Brewster." Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. IV, No. 13, 1970, p. 4.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Casserly, Patricia L. "What College Students Say About Advanced Placement--Part II." College Board Review, No. 70, 1968-69, pp. 18-22.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "N. Y. Weighs Giving a College Degree Based on Results of Equivalency Tests." Vol. 5, No. 7, 1970, p. 3.

College Entrance Examination Board. College Credit by Examination through the College-Level Examination Program. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences of the American Council on Education. "Policies of Institutions for Granting Credit for Service School and USAFI Courses, and for Admission Based on GED Test Scores." Newsletter, No. 31, 1969, p. 1.

Dyer, H. S., and Valley, J. R. Credit for Off-Campus Achievement. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1962.

Flaugher, Ronald L., Mahoney, Margaret H., and Messing, Rita B. Credit by Examination for College-Level Studies: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1967.

Gardner, John W. The Recovery of Confidence. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1970.

Hedrick, James A. "College Credit by Examination." Journal of Higher Education, No. 31, 1960, pp. 212-215.

Petersen, Richard E. "What's Really Happening in Advanced Placement? --Part I." College Board Review, No. 58, 1965-66, pp. 12-18.

Pifer, Alan, "Is It Time for an External Degree?" College Board Review, No. 78, 1970-71, pp. 5-10.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Random House, Inc., 1962.

Survey Respondents*

Alabama

Alabama A & M University
Alabama State University
Alexander City State Jr. College
Auburn University - Auburn
Auburn University - Montgomery
Calhoun State Technical Jr. College
Daniel Payne College
Huntingdon College
Jacksonville State University
Judson College
T. A. Lawson State Jr. College
Spring Hill College
Southern Union State Jr. College
Troy State University
Tuskegee Institute
University of Montevallo
University of South Alabama
Walker College

Florida

Broward Community College
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical Univ.
Florida A & M University
Florida Junior College
Florida Keys Community College
Florida State University
Fort Lauderdale University
St. Johns River Junior College
Santa Fe College
Seminole Junior College
Southeastern Bible College
Stetson University
University of South Florida

Georgia

Abraham Baldwin College
Albany Junior College
Albany State College
Clark College
DeKalb College
Gainesville Junior College
Georgia Southern College
Georgia Southwestern College
Georgia State University
Gordon Military College
Paine College
Reinhardt College
Savannah State College
Wesleyan College
West Georgia College

Kentucky

Alice Lloyd College
Asbury College
Centre College
Elizabethtown Community College
Georgetown College
Henderson Community College
Jefferson Community College
Kentucky Christian College
Kentucky State College
Kentucky Wesleyan College
Murray State University
Southeastern Christian College
Sue Bennett College
University of Kentucky

Louisiana

Centenary College
Dillard University
Grambling College
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute
Louisiana State Univ. - Baton Rouge
Louisiana State Univ. - New Orleans
Northwestern State University
Tulane University

Mississippi

Coahoma Junior College
East Mississippi Junior College
Holmes Junior College

*A few questionnaires were received too late to be used.

Survey Respondents*

Mississippi Delta Junior College
Mississippi Gulf Coast Jr. Col.
Mississippi State Col. for Women
Natchez Junior College
Rust College
Southeastern Baptist College
University of Mississippi
William Carey College

North Carolina

Barber-Scotia College
Catawba College
Duke University - Trinity College
East Carolina Univ. - Greenville
East Carolina Univ. - Cherry Point
Elizabeth City State University
Greensboro College
Johnson C. Smith University
Lees-McRae College
Louisburg College
North Carolina Central Univ.
Pembroke State University
Pitt Technical Institute
Sandhills Community College
Southeastern Community College
Southwood College
U. of North Carolina - Asheville
U. of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
U. of North Carolina - Charlotte
U. of North Carolina - Greensboro
Warren Wilson College
Western Piedmont Community College

South Carolina

Benedict College
Central Wesleyan College
Clemson University - Clemson
Clemson University - Sumter
Columbia College
Horry-Marion-Georgetown TEC
Lander College
Midlands TEC
Newberry College
Presbyterian College
U. of South Carolina - Allendale
U. of South Carolina - Columbia
U. of South Carolina - Union

Tennessee

Carson-Newman College
Cumberland College
East Tennessee State Univ.
Free Will Baptist Bible College
Knoxville College
Lee College
Martin College
George Peabody Col. for Teachers
State Technical Institute
Tennessee State University
Tusculum College
U. of Tennessee - Knoxville

Virginia

Clinch Valley College
Col. of Wm. & Mary - Richard Bland Col.
Eastern Mennonite College
Ferrum Junior College
Madison College
Old Dominion University
Roanoke College
Saint Paul's College
Southern Seminary Jr. College
Thomas Nelson Community College
Virginia Military Institute
Virginia State College
Virginia Wesleyan College
Virginia Western Community College
University of Virginia
Univ. of Va. - George Mason College
Univ. of Va. - Patrick Henry College
Wytheville Community College

*A few questionnaires were received too late to be used.

Higher Education Surveys

DIRECTIONS: Two terms used in this questionnaire need explicit definition. COURSE EXEMPTION means waiving a particular course in light of a student's past experiences; CREDIT means not only waiving the course but also granting credit that may be applied toward graduation. Please answer each question if at all possible. Give your best estimate and, if you wish, explain any answer in the "Comments" space on the back. Call 415-328-6150 collect to clarify any question. Please return by November 24.

Students obtain college course exemption/credit through various mechanisms, such as:

- AP – CEEB's Advanced Placement Program
- CLEP – CEEB's College-Level Examination Program
- ACT – American College Testing Program
- Ach – CEEB's Achievement Tests
- Exam – Departmental examinations
- USAFI – U. S. Armed Forces Institute courses
- ACE – ACE's Guide to the Evaluation of Educ. Experiences in the Armed Forces

(1) Please answer the following items for each mechanism as it pertains to your institution:

	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE	Other*
a. Currently used to grant course exemption but no credit [Check if yes]	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
b. Currently used to grant credit that may be applied toward graduation [Check if yes]	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
c. Estimate number of years you have used each program	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
d. Not using now but expect to within 2 yrs. [Check if yes]	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

e. Give a rough estimate of the number of first-time freshmen who received course exemption/credit under each program: [If none, mark 0]

		AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE	Other*
Exemption only:	Fall, 1968								
	Fall, 1970								
Credit:	Fall, 1968								
	Fall, 1970								

	AP	CLEP	ACT	Ach	Exam	USAFI	ACE	Other*
f. When are freshmen applicants usually informed of exemption/credit decisions? [Check one]								
Upon acceptance	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Upon signifying intent to enroll	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Upon registration	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
After completing advanced course	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
After appraisal of general course work	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
g. How is credit generally recorded? [Check one]								
Computed into GPA, with grade of "A"	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with grade of "B"	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with grade of "C"	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
with grade dependent on individual case	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Grade given, but not computed into GPA	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
No grade given	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
h. How do you generally treat the credit hours a transfer student was granted by his former institution under each program? [Check one]								
Accept automatically toward graduation	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Accept with qualifications	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Do not accept toward graduation	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

* Answer each item for one specific mechanism your institution may use. [Give name of mechanism in "Comments" space]

OVER

(2) How many first-time freshmen did you enroll in Fall, 1970?_____

(3) Estimate the total number of Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen who received exemption/credit under mechanisms included in Question 1:

Exemption only _____
Credit only _____
Both _____

(4) Estimate the average number of hours received by those Fall, 1970 first-time freshmen granted exemption/credit: [Circle whether semester or quarter hours]

Exemption _____ sem/qtr
Credit _____ sem/qtr

(5) Estimate the number of current high school students your institution enrolled for college credit in:

Fall, 1970 dual enrollment programs .....( )
1970 Summer programs .....( )

(6) In your judgment how much importance does your institution attach to each of the following rationales for granting exemption/credit?

Rate each: 1 - very important
2 - important
3 - not so important

Enrich student program ..... ( )
Accelerate student program ..... ( )
Create curricular flexibility ..... ( )
Expand educational opportunity .. ( )
Aid in recruitment ..... ( )
Improve educational continuity from high school to college .... ( )
Recognize applicants' talents and abilities ..... ( )
Reduce overall cost of higher education ..... ( )

(7) In your judgment how important have the following factors been in influencing your institution to establish or expand its exemption/credit policies within the past five years?

Rate each: 1 - very important
2 - important
3 - not so important

Adult community interest ..... ( )
Faculty attitudes ..... ( )
Student concerns ..... ( )
Financial considerations ..... ( )
Developments within high schools . ( )
Competition from other institutions ..... ( )

(8) How do you anticipate the exemption/credit policies of your institution will change over the next 5 years?

COMMENTS: Use this space to explain any answer

Name _____

Institution _____

Use prepaid envelope provided – Return to:

College Entrance Examination Board
Suite 200, 17 Executive Park Drive, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30329